1799. terposition of this Court, to which her settlers, the defendants below, cannot originally resort? It is a fundamental principle of the law of nature and of nations, that every government is bound to preserve peace and order, to protect individuals, to indemnify those who trust to its faith, and to prevent a dismemberment of its territory. This political and moral obligation, enforced by a regard to her public improvements, and fiscal operations, creates an interest of the highest character in the government of New-York; and such as the Court will cherish with all its benevolence and authority. 21 Vin. Abr. 181. pl. 1. Ibid. 183. pl. 4, 5. 7. Ibid. pl. 8. 11. 3 Black. Com. 255, 6.

The Court, after advisement, delivered their opinion, that as the State of New-York was not a party to the suits below, nor inter-. ested in the decision of those suits, an injunction ought not to issue.

Injunction refused. (5)

## The same Cause.

S the state of Connecticut did not appear, Hoffman moved that A she should appear on the first day of next term, or that the plaintiff be then at liberty to proceed ex parte. 3 Dal. 335. But Lewis observed, that the rule required that a subpoena issuing in a suit in equity, should be served sixty days before the return; which had not been done in the present case. The first motion was, thereupon, waived; and an alias subpoena awarded. 3 Dall. 320.

## Hazlehurst et al. versus The United States.

IN error from the Circuit Court for the district of South-Carolina. A rule had been obtained by Lee, the attorney-general, at the opening of the Court, that the plaintiffs appear and prosecute their writ of error within the term, or suffer a non-pros.: but it was found, that errors had been assigned in the Court below, and

(5) Hoffman. In every grant by New-York, there is a reservation of gold and silver mines, and of five acres per cent. for roads. The bill might, besides, be amended, by averying the state to be interested in a residuum of the land, if that would be sufficient to sustain the prayer for an injunction.

WASHINGTON, Justice The amendment would not satisfy me; for, my opinion is founded upon the fact, that New-York is not interested in the suits below.

CHASE, Justice. It is a mere bill to settle boundaries; and we must take it as we find it; not as it might be made.

ELLSWORTH, Chief Justice. If there had been a quorum of judges, without my attendance, I should have declined sitting in this cause. As it is, I am glad that the opinion of my brethren, dispenses with the necessity of my taking a part in the decision.

a joinder

a joinder in error entered here. The rule was, therefore, changed 1799. to the following: "that unless the plaintiffs in error appear and argue the errors to-morrow, a non-pros. be entered." The plaintiffs not appearing, the writ of error was non-prossed, according to the

## Turner, Administrator, versus Enrille.

ERROR from the Circuit Court of South-Carolina. The record, as abridged for the Judges, presented the following

"The Marquis de Caso Enrille instituted an action on the case against Thomas Turner, the administrator of Wright Stanley, in the Circuit Court of North-Carolina, of June term 1795.

"A declaration in case was filed 'by the Marquis de Caso nrille, of in the island of 'of June term 1796, Enrille, of in which it is set forth, that Wright Stanley (the intestate) and John Wright Stanley and James Greene were 'merchants and partners at Newbern in the said district: that Wright Stanley survived the other partners; that on the 4th of June 1791, in the lifetime of all the partners, they were indebted 'unto the said Marquis in dollars,' and in consideration thereof, assumed to pay, &c. The 2d count insimul computassent, when the said partners 'were found in arrear to the said Marquis in other dollars,' &c. The plaintiff concludes with the usual averments of non-payment, 'to the damage of the said Marquis dollars, &c.

"On the 30th of November 1796, the defendant appeared, and pleaded, 1st. Non assumpsit intest. Replication and issue. 2d. The statute of limitations as to the intestate: Replication, an account current between merchant and factor. Rejoinder and issue. 3d. Setoff, that the plaintiff was indebted to the intestate, on the 1st of Yanuary 1792, in more than the damages by the plaintiff sustained; &c. to wit, in 4000 dollars, for money had and received by the plaintiff to the intestate's use, which sum is still due to the defendant, as administrator. Replication that plaintiff owed nothing, &c. Rejoinder and issue. 4th. The statute of limitations as to the administrator. Replication that the demand was made within three years, &c. Rejoinder and issue. 5th. Plene administravit. Replication assets. Rejoinder and issue.

"On the 1st of June 1799, the issues were tried, a verdict was given on all the issues for the plaintiff, and the jury assessed damages at 3289 65 dollars. Judgment for damages, costs and

"Writ of error. Errors assigned: 1st. That it does not appear on the pleadings, &c. that either plaintiff or defendant was an alien or that they were citizens of different states. 2d That there are blanks in the declaration for places, dates, and sums. 3d. The general errors. Plea, In nulle est erratum. Replication and issue."